3 November 2026

Chair Rasmussen and Supervisors,

Regarding Board of Supervisors (BoS) 3 Nov 2026 Agenda Item 6.6 for Consideration of Agreement between Lake County Special Districts and Tyler Technologies, Inc, for a Software as a Service agreement for Financial Management, Revenue Management, Enterprise Asset Management, comments and questions come to mind.

The documents presented for this agenda item reference the **WorkDay implementation** and assumes that implementation has been successfully completed.

1. Has the WorkDay implementation been successfully completed?
2. What is the test plan for the integration of Cascade Wincams to Tyler Technologies, Inc. modules and the integration of the Tyler Technology, Inc. modules with WorkDay?

General observation and high-level comment follow:

- Project schedule or timeline is buried on page 50 of Exhibit E.
- Before signing an agreement with a Contractor, a schedule and timeline should be identified and approved by the BoS. Go-live is proposed for July 2027, starting with Financials and continuing through July 2028 with Utility Billing.
- If the County is contracting for Software as a Service, the Contractor's change request process must be reviewed for meeting the County's needs. Specifically, if a change to Tyler software is needed immediately to accommodate WorkDay, can Tyler Technologies, Inc. response meet the County's needs?

A few high-level project questions follow:

1. Has or will Special Districts be involved in developing User Acceptance Test case scenarios?
    a. If not, why not?
    b. Will Special Districts staff take part in User Acceptance Testing? If not, why not?
2. Have the go / no go conditions for go-live been identified?
3. Who is making the go / no go decision?
4. What is the rollback plan?

5. Is the FY26/27 budgeted amount for the software functionality provided by Cascade Wincams plus modules from Tyler Technologies, Inc. not to exceed $141,575?
    a. This amount appears to be the annual software as a service expense.
        i. If yes, the agreement to pay this annual amount is for what time period beyond FY 2026-27? For how many years? And is the purchase to be authorized each year by the BoS?
        ii. For annual support, what is the process and schedule for Tyler software release for enhancements, defect fixes? It is probably handled as a change request.
        iii. How would Tyler handle a critical change request needed to accommodate WorkDay?
    b. Implementation cost is a one-time expense not to exceed $423,108?
    c. If the implementation amount is under this above estimated amount, the unspent funds go where? Capital Projects – Special Districts fund? General Fund?
    d. An additional $213,317 for contingency funding is available but conditions for using contingency funds haven't been identified; the Software as a Service Agreement document notes that the agreement (for BoS consideration on 3 Nov 2026) is separate from the Tyler Technologies, Inc. contract under consideration by your Board. Who has the authority to request contingency funding and under what conditions? If the conditions for authorizing use of contingency haven't been set, when will it?

6. **Comments and Questions on Exhibits**

Exhibit A Investment Summary "details the products and services to be delivered by us, or a third party … under the Agreement." Exhibit A does not plainly say who is responsible for integrating Taylor Technology, Inc. software with WorkDay.

Under Professional Services, **Onsite Implementation expense** is almost equal to remote implementation expense. The Software as a Service Agreement document indicates that for the vendor, a remote implementation effort is a priority. Oddly, "Estimated Travel Expenses excl in Contract" is listed as $21,920.00 in Exhibit A (page 4).

Exhibit B Hardware & Third-Party Products.

3.3 Third-Party Services. There is no mention of **interface support** for third-party software. As there are releases (updates, defect corrections and enhancements) of

Tyler and **WorkDay software**, County of Lake must be mindful of potential interface issues. **The County's software needs may require greater attention to release and change management to coordinate implementation of software releases and their impacts to other software used by the County.** The ideal resource to oversee County software release and change management may be a resource with centralized responsibility for County Information Technology (IT).

The resolution of Interface issues with Third-Party Services (such as WorkDay) may be covered under this section, but **details are to be set in the future**. **This may put the County in a negotiating disadvantage.**

Exhibit C Service Level Agreement.

Between Tyler Technologies, Inc. software and third-party software (e.g. WorkDay), it may not be possible to identify the root cause (e.g. which software) of an outage. It could be difficult to determine which software is responsible for the problem. **At this time, it would be prudent to review Service Level Agreement and third-party software sections in the County's contract for WorkDay implementation and operation.**

Downtime. "Downtime does not include those instances in which only a Defect is present." This exclusion seems to reflect a contractor's ideal--not an industry standard. A (software) defect can cause downtime. If so, defect-caused downtime should count against performance metrics for Service Availability.

Exhibit E, "**Statement of Work**" for this agreement, referenced in Tyler software as a service agreement (File Name: Lake County Special Districts CA Tyler EERP SaaS 061526 (Tyler Signed 062326)).

In general, identification of "**Acceptance Criteria**" in this exhibit is helpful, but criteria listed throughout the exhibit is not complete. **"Acceptance Criteria" listed in Exhibit E needs to be thoroughly reviewed for completeness before BoS signs the agreement with Tyler.**

On page 3, **project governance** identifies **roles and responsibilities**. For clarity, the **identity of stakeholders should be determined before the BoS approves the agreement**. Specifically, for the County (Client Leadership), who is the Executive Sponsor? BoS—as the one "champions the project, secures buy in, provides oversight and has authority for "ultimate decision-making"?; who is on the steering committee ("Monitors progress, goals and objectives")?; and Project Manager ("Oversees project schedule and tasks")? Special Districts Director or designee?

On p. 7, Tyler identifies **contract management** as a function of the Software as a Service. **Who on the County team is on point for contract management of this agreement?** Special Districts Director? Chief Administrative Officer? Given the recent confusion over County budget roles and responsibilities, it is best to clarify this point before contract execution.

p. 17 **6.1.3 Infrastructure Planning**

Among **deliverables**, **User Acceptance Test Scripts** should be listed. Acceptance Criteria for Deliverables should be more demanding than "Delivery of document". Revised criteria could be: "Meets client requirements as noted in the Request for Proposal."

p. 27 **Acceptance Criteria for Configured System**: Needs to be identified and listed.

p. 30 **6.3.7 Control Point 3: Prepare Solution Stage Acceptance**. Testing plan and User Acceptance Testing Scripts should be added to the deliverables list.

p. 32 **6.4.2 Go-Live Readiness**

Recommendations:

- Add to Inputs list, "Go / No-Go Criteria; Roll Back Plan (including criteria for roll back decision)"
- Under "Acceptance Criteria" for Deliverables, for "Updated go-live checklist", add "LCSD accepts updated go-live checklist". Contractor's delivery of the deliverable is not a sufficient criterion for deliverable acceptance.

p. 37 **6.5.4 Control Point 5: Production Stage Acceptance**

The Contractor states, "Advancement to the Close stage is not dependent upon Tyler's receipt of this Stage Acceptance." **If BoS approves the agreement with Tyler without challenging this statement, the County's position can be compromised if it disagrees with Tyler on satisfactory completion of go-live and operational state of the production environment (Tyler software).**

p. 39 **6.6.1 Phase Closeout**

Recommendation: Add to Outputs / Deliverables section "Critical defects/issues"; add "Acceptance Criteria" for this addition: "LCSD acceptance of resolution plan and schedule for critical issues/defects"

p. 41 **Quality of Legacy Data**. A factor in maintaining project schedule is the state of legacy data. **What is the status and quality of legacy data? Are there**

anticipated legacy data issues that can impact conversion or Tyler go-live timeline?

Good governance is a community effort. The comments and questions above are offered in that spirit. The above recommendations and questions are informed by years of Information Technology experience in software program management, release management, change management, implementations and operations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Margaux Kambara
Lake County Resident